

REMARKS

A. The Section 102 Rejections Based on Deshpande

Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 14-18, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Deshpande, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/00718881 (“Deshpande”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims. It is to these claims that Applicants now turn, it being understood that the remarks which follow apply equally to claims 2, 6-10, 14-18, 23 and 24 because these claims depend on claim 1, 9 or 17, respectively. Further, Applicants note that claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 18 and 19 have been canceled.

In the Office Action the Examiner acknowledges that Deshpande does not disclose the claimed “depository of digital multimedia content”, as in claim 1 and as similarly set forth in claims 9 and 17.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Deshpande does not disclose the additional feature of a timing parameter operable to indicate when an RTSP message is to be activated by a network node.

Instead, Deshpande appears to disclose an RTSP Play message that indicates when a video is to be played back by a client or user (e.g., “npt” or Normal Play Time), not when such a video is to be activated by the network node that receives the message.

Accordingly, because Deshpande does not disclose each and every feature of the claims it cannot anticipate the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1, 6-9, 14-17, 23 and 24.

B.) The Section 103 Rejections Based on Deshpande and Tao et al.

Claims 3-5, 11-13 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Deshpande and Tao et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,441, 832 (“Tao”). Applicants disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Because claims 3-5, 11-13 and 19-22 depend on either claims 1, 9 and 17 and because Tao does not make up for the deficiencies in Deshpande, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over the combination of Deshpande and Tao for the reasons set forth above.

Further, Applicants note the following. In the Office Action the Examiner acknowledges that Deshpande does not disclose a depository of digital multimedia content that is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a plurality of levels that correspond to respective media identifier dimensions of an RTSP multidimensional pointer as in claims 1, 9 and 17 from which claims 3-5, 11-13 and 19-22 depend. To make up for this deficiency the Examiner relies on Tao.

However, Tao does not disclose a depository of digital multimedia content that is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a plurality of levels that correspond to respective media identifier dimensions of an RTSP multidimensional pointer. Instead, Tao appears to disclose known playlist hierarchies that are unrelated to media identifier dimensions of an RSTP multidimensional pointer.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 4, 5, 12, 13 and 20-22 would not have been obvious at the time the instant application was filed based on the combined disclosures of Desphande and Tao. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 4, 5, 12, 13, and 20-22.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC.

By: /John E. Curtin/

John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 1995
Vienna, Virginia 22183
(703) 266-3330